UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,069	02/28/2005	Amir Karby	P-8978-US	6615

49443 7590 10/05/2007

PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP
1500 BROADWAY 12TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/526,069	KARBY, AMIR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 July 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02/28/2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the RCE filed on: 07/25/2007.

2. Claims 22, 23, and 24 are new. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 02/28/2005 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 8, 15, 22, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell, JR (US Patent: 5,727, 161, issued: Mar. 10, 1998, filed: Sep. 16, 1994) in further view of Khan et al (US Patent 6,157,934, issued: Dec. 5, 2000, filed: Oct. 15, 1996).

With regards to claim 1, Purcel, JR. teaches a memory having stored instructions, that when executed, result in providing a customizable application comprising:

a) *At least one spreadsheet each with at least one end user editable spreadsheet block each relating to a particular class of an object*: whereas Purcel, JR teaches implementing a spreadsheet modeling system, which includes the use of existing spreadsheet applications (column 9, lines 25-29: whereas the modeling system works

with external spreadsheet software). These spreadsheet applications further include spreadsheets that allow for user entry/edits that relate to a particular class of product (column 11, lines 52-62: whereas, spreadsheets can relate to a particular class or component-class for analysis).

i) At least one input spreadsheet cell each associated with an input parameter selected by an end user from a plurality of input parameters: Whereas in Fig. 18, an end user selects from a plurality of input parameters, for which the input parameters in this case are factors affecting a goal/product. Illustratively, in Figure 19, the input parameter/factor's associated cell address is selected as shown next to the 'Factor 1 heading'.

ii) At least one output spreadsheet cell each associated with an output parameter selected by an end user from a plurality of output parameters: Whereas in Fig 18, an end user selects from a plurality of output parameters, for which the output parameters in this case are a list of output Goals. Furthermore, illustratively in Figure 19, an output cell's address that is associated with the output parameter chosen by the user is selected (reference number 1904).

iii) At least one spreadsheet script for receiving input values from at least one input spreadsheet cell, computing output values of at least one end user selected output parameter, and returning output values to their associated output spreadsheet cells (column 11, lines 35-67: whereas, Purcel, JR's spreadsheet system implements a spreadsheet system that automatically updates output values that are associated with output spreadsheet cells located in the same or different spread sheet pages, upon

receiving an input value from an input cell). Additionally, since the collecting and output of cells are automatic, it is inherent that computer executable instructions are being executed to perform the functionality that of a script.

b) *A hard coded unification builder to generate a unified spreadsheet from at least two spreadsheet blocks* (whereas Purcel, JR teaches implementing a spreadsheet modeling system, which includes the use spreadsheet software that link spreadsheet blocks (column 11, lines 35-55: whereas, spreadsheets can link to a set of cells in the same of other spreadsheets)), *whose relations are defined* from specific factors/parameters and goals (Fig 18, whereas the factors/parameters and are chosen with respect to a particular goal). Additionally, a *unified spreadsheet* is generated (whereas a final plan model spreadsheet is generated by linking together other plan model spread sheets either manually (Fig 8, column 18, lines 10-24)) or automatically (whereas linking is performed based on the input and output factors selected (Fig 9, column 18, lines 21-26: whereas alternative linking is based also on user selection such as indicated in Fig 9.))

However, Purcel Jr, does not expressly teach at least two spreadsheet blocks whose relations are defined *from an input graph*.

Kahn teaches at *least two spreadsheet blocks whose relations are defined from an input graph*: whereas, a unified spread sheet chains constituent spreadsheets (Fig 1: the spread sheet links at least *two spreadsheet blocks* to represent the Intent To workflow Production) for which at least one item of production information is exchanged

between the constituent spreadsheet blocks *whose relations are defined from an input graph* shown in Fig 3 (whereas, a selected input graph shows each class/node produces an output of production such as a manager approval-output/item).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, Jr's spreadsheet modeling system to further use an input graph as a basis for generating a unified spreadsheet for producing at least one unit of production as taught by Kahn et al. The combination of Purcell, Jr and Kahn et al, would have allowed Purcell, Jr's system to have "permitted a user to have graphically established linking of cells to determine the flow of information without having to write lines of programming code (Kahn et al, column 2, lines 11-16).

With regards to claim 8, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, the combination of Purcel Jr, and Kahn teach a memory having stored instructions that when executed results in providing a customizable application comprising:

Selecting a graph of a production of an item (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), *said graph including at least one resource object* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) *and at least one process performed on said*

resource (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, whereas, the resource in the input graph is directed/exchanged between constituent spreadsheet blocks).

Retrieving a plurality of spread sheet blocks, a first of said spreadsheet blocks corresponding to said resource, and a second of said spreadsheet blocks corresponding to said process performed on said resource (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, by the teachings of Kahn, and also further detailed in Fig. 1 of Kahn: whereas, said resource is represented as a spreadsheet blocks; and as also shown in Fig. 2, a second of spreadsheet blocks define the process/workflow defined performed on said resource by accepting output from another spreadsheet block).

Generating a spreadsheet comprising said plurality of spreadsheet blocks, a relation of said spreadsheet blocks defined by said graph (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, a refined unified spreadsheet is generated (the refined unified spreadsheet a refined subset of an original unified spreadsheet, defined by an input graph).

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 22, the combination of Purcell Jr, and Kahn teach *wherein said first spreadsheet block includes an input spreadsheet cell and an output spreadsheet cell, and said second spreadsheet block includes an input spreadsheet cell and an output spreadsheet* (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 22, and is rejected under similar rationale), *and wherein generating comprises linking said output spreadsheet of said first spreadsheet block to said input spreadsheet cell of said second spreadsheet block in accordance with said relation defined by said*

graph (Fig. 2 of Kahn, whereas, the generating/defining is based upon the input graph/relation which links the input and output of spreadsheet blocks)).

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 22, the combination of Purcell Jr, and Kahn teach comprising a *plurality of spreadsheet* blocks, and also Kahn further teaches the plurality of spreadsheet blocks can be configured such that *a rating scheme [is] included in one of said plurality of spreadsheet blocks to reduce a number of production options presented to a user* (column 7, lines 50-58: whereas a user can limit the cell range to reduce the number of production options/range presented to a user).

5. Claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell, JR (US Patent: 5,727, 161, issued: Mar. 10, 1998, filed: Sep. 16, 1994) and Khan et al (US Patent 6,157,934, issued: Dec. 5, 2000, filed: Oct. 15, 1996) in further view of Takahashi et al (US Patent: 5,513,356, issued: Apr. 30, 1996, filed: Apr. 22, 1991).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Kahn et al and Purcell, JR's spreadsheet modeling system teaches *said object relates to the construction of a finished product* (whereas a finished product is in terms of a final output unit of work, and constructed from the results of other producers of work as seen in (Kahn et al, Fig. 3)), and *said unification builder links at least two spreadsheet blocks in accordance with a product description graph logically representing the finished product to generate at least one unified product description spreadsheet*, as explained in claim 1, but does not expressly teach *including at least one feasible production plan for producing a product in said product description.*

However, Takahashi et al teaches a table/spreadsheet production-modeling system (column 7, lines 24-30), which *includes at least one feasible production plan for producing a product in said product description* (Abstract, "The building process is indicated to the operator so that the operator can change a parameter and/or rebuild the procedure"). Takahashi et al further teaches constructing a production plan of parts (column 14, lines 66-67: whereas, a planned order table is generated in Fig 28 that represents the production plan of parts).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, Jr and Kahn et al's spreadsheet modeling system to further include a production modeling system that further includes the generation of a production plan as taught by Takahashi et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Takahashi et al would have allowed Purcell, JR's system to have made it possible for a user to have "defined the output specification for the information processing based only a knowledge of the business the user is in charge of" (Takahashi et al, column 5, lines 3-9).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al both teach *spreadsheet blocks, and said product description,* as explained in claim 1 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. However Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al do not expressly teach a spreadsheet block, *which includes instructions for user, prompts for assisting in the entry of* said product description.

Takahashi et al teaches a spreadsheet/table, *which includes instructions for user, prompts for assisting in the entry of* said product description (Fig 17, and Fig 18:

whereas, at the bottom of a table block, there are prompts instructing the user how to proceed for a particular entry).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al's spreadsheet blocks and product description, such that they include prompts for instructing a user as taught by Takahashi et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Takahashi et al would have allowed Purcell, JR's spreadsheet modeling system to have further allowed "the ability to have received the output specification by the user in an interactive manner" (Takahashi et al, column 13, lines 38-40)

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Purcell, JR and Kahn et al teach *said object*, along with *said unification builder* that *links at least two spreadsheet blocks according with a production flow graph of production process, and terminating in the finished product to generate a unified spreadsheet,* as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Purcell, JR and Kahn et al do not expressly teach a system wherein said object *relates to resources available to produce finished products, the production process starting from raw materials, and a* unified *estimation* spreadsheet, *for producing the finished product in a product description.*

Takahashi et al teaches said object *relates to resources available to produce finished products and the production process starting from raw materials* (whereas, the table/spreadsheet production system uses an input lot table to derive the resources available to produce a final product (column 10, lines 55-58: the knowledge base includes data on parts-raw materials)). Furthermore, the final output table/spreadsheet

is a final *estimated spreadsheet, for producing the finished product in a product description*: whereas, input raw material data includes estimated quantities (column 13, lines 60-63), and the final production plan table/spreadsheet (column 14, lines 66-67), therefore is derived from estimated data for producing the finished product.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al's unification builder, such that it links spreadsheet blocks based on resources and raw materials used to produce a product, and to have modified the parameters for generating a unification spreadsheet such that the parameters are based off of estimated data for producing the finished product, as taught by Takahashi et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Takahashi et al, would have allowed Purcell's spreadsheet modeling system to have allowed a user to have inputted fragmental piece information about components/raw materials, it is possible for the user to obtain the content of the information processing without the need of manuals or experts (Takahashi et al, column 16, lines 8-12).

With regards to claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al teach a system with a *spreadsheet script*, as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al do not expressly teach the spreadsheet script *defines an end user defined intermediate parameter having a computed value in accordance with a given set of input values which is capable of being manually overwritten by an end user.*

Takahashi et al teaches *an end user defined intermediate parameter having a computed value in accordance with a given set of input values which is capable of being*

manually overwritten by an end user (column 14, lines 49-55: whereas, a part requirement table can have its computed data (that was calculated from input values) updated/overwritten by an end user).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al's spreadsheet script to further include the ability to define an end user intermediate parameter as taught by Takahashi et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Kan et al, and Takahashi et al would have allowed Purcell, JR's system to have allowed user more pre-emptive control over the calculation and processing of a production graph.

With regards to claim 9, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 10, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 11, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 12, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell, JR (US Patent: 5,727, 161, issued: Mar. 10, 1998, filed: Sep. 16, 1994) and Khan et al (US Patent 6,157,934, issued: Dec. 5, 2000, filed: Oct. 15, 1996) in further view of Bourdead'hui et al. (US Patent: 5,995,719, issued: Nov. 30, 1999, filed: Mar 25, 1997).

With regards to claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Purcell, JR, and Khan et al teach a system wherein said customizable application is *designed for providing information regarding a product description for producing at least one unit of product* (workflow product), in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Purcell, JR, and Khan et al do not teach a system wherein at least one unit of *printed finished product, and is capable of receiving impositioning information regarding a printed component of said printed finished product.*

Bourdead'hui et al teaches at least one unit of *printed finished product* (column 1, lines 25-28: whereas printed paper goes through a finishing stage), *and is capable of receiving impositioning information regarding a printed component* for proofing *of said printed finished product* (Abstract: whereas, the finished product to be printed includes impositioning data for each component/paper-product, and a system uses the impositioning data for proofing).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, JR and Kahn et al's spreadsheet modeling application to further include modeling data for producing printed finished products and receiving impositioning data, as taught by Bourdead'hui et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Khan et al, and Bourdead'hui et al would have allowed Purcell, JR to have implemented a simulated the results of printing an imposed document (Bourdead'hui et al, column 2, lines 37-42)

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al teach wherein the end user customizable computer spreadsheet application based expert system, as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Furthermore, the computer spreadsheet application includes linking of spreadsheets that are also taught by Purcell, JR, and Kahn et al, as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. The linked spreadsheets blocks shown by Kahn et al include at least three spreadsheet blocks as seen in Kahn et al's Fig 1 diagram.

Although Purcell, JR and Kahn et al teach at least three spreadsheet blocks, they do not explicitly teach *a first spreadsheet block for modeling a production of paper*

components of said printed finished product, a second spreadsheet block for modeling a production of non-paper components of said printed finished product, and a third spreadsheet block for modeling an integrating of at least one paper component and at least one integrated component and at least one non-paper component.

The spreadsheet models taught by Purcell, JR and Kahn et al can be modeled '*for*' any particular criteria, and is merely an intent of use for a spreadsheet model. For the purpose of clarity and supplemental information, the Examiner will include a reference.

Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Bourdead'hui et al teach *said printed finished product*, as explained in the rejection for claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, Bourdead'hui et al further teaches said printed finished product further comprises *production of paper components*: whereas a printing stage in production is taught (column 1, lines 15-21)), *non-paper components* (whereas a pre-printing/pre-press stage is taught (column 1, lines 21-25: which includes non-paper components)), an *integration of at least one non-paper and at least one paper component* (whereas a finished production stage is taught, which integrates non-paper components and paper components together for a finished product (column 1, lines 26-28)).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Bourdead'hui et al's spreadsheet modeling system to further included three spreadsheets such that each of them are modeled according to different models/stages such as for production of paper

components, non-paper components, or an integration of non-paper and paper components as also taught by Bourdead'hui et al. The combination of Purcell, JR, Kahn et al, and Bourdead'hui et al would have allowed the Purcell, JR's spreadsheet modeling system to be specialized for developing models for the paper production and printing industry.

With regards to claim 13, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, for a method performing a method similar to that of the system in claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 20, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, for a medium storing instructions that when executed, perform a similar method to the system in claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 07/25/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. With regards to claims 1, 8, and 15, the applicant first argues that neither Purcell nor Kahn, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, "a builder to generate a unified spreadsheet from at least two spreadsheet blocks" (bottom of page 10 of applicant remarks), since Kahn teaches spreadsheet blocks that are linked to a unified

spreadsheet, but such unified spreadsheet is already provided to the invention in Kahn, and is not generated from the spreadsheet blocks. However, this argument is not persuasive, since although Kahn does start with a unified spreadsheet, a virtual second refined unified spreadsheet is generated/created from the linking of at least two spreadsheet blocks defined by an input graph (the unified spreadsheet comprising a bounded subset of linked blocks from the original unified spreadsheet, the subset defined by the input graph, as shown in Fig. 1 of Kahn, in the "grey" color toned spreadsheet cells). Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive. Secondly the applicant argues that Purcell, JR does not describe generating a unified spreadsheet from a spreadsheet, since the cited text in Purcell addresses cells whose values are linked to other cells in other spreadsheet, and linking cell values is a simple matter of inputting a number into two places, such two places being two spreadsheets or two spreadsheet blocks (top of page 11, of applicant remarks). However, this argument is not persuasive since the linking of spreadsheet values is not a matter of inputting a number into two places, but rather referencing a common memory locations, such that both spreadsheets are linked to the same memory cell location for a value (column 11, lines 35-55: whereas cell values *reference* the memory locations with respect to each other, instead of just inputting a number into two places). Thus, spreadsheet linking is established, with respect to a common memory address reference; and the applicant's argument is not persuasive. Third, the applicant argues that Kahn and Purcell each start with a unified spreadsheet, and fill in cells or blocks in accordance with defined relationships among them (middle of page 11, of applicant remarks). The examiner

agrees, and further points out that a second unified spreadsheet (a subset of the first/original spreadsheet) is defined the relationships among them. Thus, a refined unified spreadsheet is generated.

9. With regards to claims 2-5, 9-12, and 16-19, for being allowable since they depend directly or indirectly from one or more of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15, is not persuasive since the independent claims have been shown/explained to be rejected.

10. With respect to claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21 for being allowable since they depend directly or indirectly from one or more of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, 15 is not persuasive, since the independent claims have been shown/explained to be rejected.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 09/27/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
September 27, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER